



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

many poor books. Yet in spite of these blemishes Mr. Halleck has made a convenient and meritorious text-book. Well chosen illustrations and a good index help to make the book attractive and valuable both for school use and for reference.

CLARK SUTHERLAND NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

SHAKESPEARE.

Richard the Third up to Shakespeare, by GEORGE B. CHURCHILL, Ph. D., *Palæstra*, Herausgegeben von Alois Brandl und Erich Schmidt, No. x. Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1900. 8vo, pp. 548.

THIS is a formidable thesis worked out in copious detail by one of Professor Brandl's students. The idea is a fruitful one. It is to trace the growth of the "Richard saga" from its beginnings until the material of it came into Shakespeare's hands, separating at all points the historical from the purely legendary, and exploring the source of each item of legend as it enters the saga. The work has been done solidly and well, and is an important contribution to Shakesperian scholarship. The materials have been carefully digested, and are displayed with almost more than German thoroughness.

Five hundred full pages is almost too much for even a dissertation in the Shakesperian field. Most of the excessively long analyses of chronicles, poems, and plays might have been retrenched without great loss to the reader, and more frequent reference made to the originals. Still, as it is, here you have all of the necessary material and a reference-book and source-book for *Richard the Third*, all in one volume. The all too numerous misprints, not half of which are corrected in the long list of "Corrigenda" at the end of the volume, and for which the author excuses himself on the ground of distance from the press, are discreditable to *Palæstra*. If theses and other books in English are to be printed in Germany, they should be held to a stricter standard of typographical accuracy than has been displayed of late years.

The first half of the volume deals with "Richard in the Chronicles," the second with "Richard in Poetry and the Drama." Of the chronicles the so-called "Second Continuation of the History of Croyland Monastery" receives careful consideration as the best of the original historical authorities. Here we have tolerably firm footing. Richard, of course, is the slayer of the princes of the Queen's kin, and of Hastings, but with the other crimes in Shakespeare's list he is not charged. In the chronicles of Rous, de Comines, and Bernard André, the blackening process has begun. With Sir Thomas More and Polydore Vergil, however, we first meet the chief sources of the purely legendary elements of the Richard saga. From them Shakespeare's immediate sources, Holinshed and Hall, draw their main supplies. The author has manifested great critical patience and skill in disentangling from the mass of the sources the essential contributions of each to the legend.

In the anonymous *History of the Arrival of Edward IV*, (Camden Society, 1838) the only purely Yorkist account of the period, Richard (Gloucester) is uncharged with any crime. Warkworth's *Chronicle* (Camden Society, 1839) is the first of the Lancastrian series. Here the idea of Fate and Retribution is first emphasized. Richard here figures only subordinately.

In the *Second Continuation of the History of Croyland Monastery*, we have the first full history of Richard's reign. Here are related the execution of the Queen's kin by Richard after the death of Edward IV, the fate of Hastings, the intrigues of Richard and Buckingham, the imprisonment of the young king in the Tower, the forced appeal of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the queen in the sanctuary at Westminster to give up the young Duke of York, and her compliance, the seizing of the throne by Richard on the pretext that the princes were bastards, the death of the princes in the Tower, the first arrival of Richmond, the death of Queen Anne (no suggestion that Richard poisoned her), Richard's plans to marry his niece and their frustration, the second landing of Richmond at Milford in Wales while Richard, trusting to prophecy, was expecting him to land at Milford, near

Southampton, the battle of Bosworth, Richard's terrifying dreams, and the death of Richard bravely fighting. Rous (*Historia Regum Angliæ*), who follows, is the first to describe Richard's person and deformities. The treatment throughout is hostile, while Henry VII (Richmond) is extravagantly flattered. Next in turn de Comines adds several items to the legend. It is he who reports current rumors that Richard was the murderer of Henry VI, of Queen Anne, and the princes. Here too is first mentioned that Clarence's death was by drowning in a butt of malmsey.

Bernard André's *History of Henry VII* is a thoroughly partisan work. Here Richard is painted as a monster of cruelty, as in a later legend. Still he is not yet charged with the deaths of Clarence or of Queen Anne, and the fact that Richard had been named Protector by Edward, and did not usurp the function here first appears. Here too, fully depicted, is Shakespeare's heroic Richmond. In Fabyan's *Chronicle* appear, for the first time, Buckingham's betrayal by Banister, and other slight items in the history. The relation of More's *History of Richard III* to the Shakesperian story has already been studied elsewhere in detail. Most significant in it perhaps is its analysis of Richard's character. More, too, makes his additions to the legend. The account of the council meeting where Hastings is arrested is his. The death of Henry VII is imputed to Richard's own initiative, without the suggestion of Edward. Richard's intention of seizing the crown from the moment of Edward's death is insisted upon. Thus his policy acquires unity.

"The winning of the young Duke of York away from his mother's protection, the subtle messages by which Buckingham is induced to follow Richard in all his plans, the double councils, the dramatic plot which brings Hastings to his death, the statement to the citizens of Hastings treason, with the device of the rusty armour, the previously prepared proclamation of a subsequently discovered crime, the sermon of Shaw and the intended *coup* of Richard's opportune appearance, Buckingham's speech at Guildhall, the scene at Baynard's castle, where the crown is pressed upon the reluctant Richard, the reconciliation with Fogge"—

all these incidents are here reduced to a whole

and made ready to Shakespeare's hand. But above all it is More who makes prominent the struggle of Richard's conscience, the nemesis which overtook him in the inward tortures of his own soul. This, of course, in its literary treatment, is the dramatic kernel of the whole story. Dramatically, too, More makes much use of prophecies and omens attending the various tragic events of the story.

Polydore Vergil was the chief authority for that part of the legend which More's *History* did not cover. "The saga of Richard as it came to Shakespeare, so far as it is not More's is almost wholly Vergil's." Vergil adds to the story in several minor particulars, but his chief contribution is his insistence upon the motive of divine vengeance: the idea that the disasters of the time were meted out as punishment for the sins of the fathers. Hall's *Chronicle* brings more into view Richard's early career and his personal prowess and bravery, yet Richard is blackened by many additional touches. Hall, more than the rest, heightens the pathos of the fate of the murdered princes in the Tower. He has several minor additions adopted by Shakespeare, but substantially he follows without change his sources, More, Vergil, de Comines, and Fabyan. Holinshed follows Hall, Stow, Fabyan, More, and others, and introduces little that is new.

"Thus though Shakespeare may in writing *Richard III* have based his play almost wholly on the form of the saga which he found in Holinshed, yet in the formation of the saga Holinshed is of very slight importance."

In regard to the importance of Vergil's *History* the author establishes a new point and maintains that Grafton's continuation of Hardyng, which has heretofore been credited as an original authority for many particulars, is nothing more than a free translation of Vergil (p. 163).

In the second part of the volume various literary treatments of the story of Richard III are considered. The most important of these are the several poems dealing with the period in the *Mirror for Magistrates*, Legge's Latin play of *Richardus Tertius* and the *True Tragedy of Richard the Third*. In the *Mirror for Magistrates* the author finds further confirmation (in addition to that found in

More) for Shakespeare's representation of Clarence's death at Richard's hands, a point generally overlooked by Shakespeare editors (p. 242-245).

The study of Legge's *Richardus Tertius* is full and valuable. Professor Churchill makes large claims for this play. "To Legge," he asserts, "was due the turning of the drama in England in an entirely new direction." For this play was the first full-fledged historical drama dealing with English history. Bale's *Kyng Johan* was essentially a morality play, and of course no chronicle play in the true sense. Legge's play was very popular, and Marlowe, Peele, Greene, Nash, and others of the University set doubtless knew it. Hence its influence upon their work is to be inferred. But as *Richardus Tertius* is, except in certain formal respects, as the author shows, almost entirely a tragedy on the Senecan model, and as the hint at least for the dramatic use of English history might be taken from Bale, it will not do to make too much of this point. Legge follows the chronicles very closely for his facts, but in other respects, as the author has shown with such painstaking scholarship, the greater part of his work is almost a cento from Seneca. In the use of action and in its disregard of the unities, however, the play is not Senecan. Legge's conception of Richard's character too, is purely Senecan, and dramatically far inferior to Shakespeare's or to that of the author of the *True Tragedy*. Direct influence upon Shakespeare there was none.

Lacey's *Richardus Tertius*, usually referred to as an "imitation" of Legge's play, is, Professor Churchill has discovered, merely a transcript of the latter.

The *True Tragedy of Richard the Third* similarly is analyzed *in extenso*. Its position as the unique representative of a mixed type, the English chronicle-history and the tragedy of revenge, is significant. Here first is to be found a history play presenting a central and dominating figure.

Crude as its workmanship is, it has the prime dramatic virtue of centering the chief interest on the inner nature of the hero, not on the mere story of his acts and fate. Herein the author attempts to trace the manifest influence of Marlowe, especially the Marlowe of

Faustus and of *Tamburlaine*. Incidentally the author corrects a couple of Mr. Fleay's errors (pp. 439 ff., 444). Professor Churchill accepts the general view that this play depends upon and follows *3 Henry VI*, adducing new evidence in proof. In regard to its relations to Shakespeare's *Richard III*, he comes to the support of Boswell, Skottowe, Field, Lloyd and the others who have upheld the theory that Shakespeare knew and made some use of the *True Tragedy*,—unless, with Lowell, Halliwell, and Fleay, it can be maintained that they both go back to an earlier play, now lost. In the first place the fundamental conception of the character and punishment of Richard in both has much in common.

Again, the speech of Rivers to the young king in both, otherwise unexplained, shows probable dependence. The gist of the proof is missed in Professor Churchill's citation, through the omission (p. 504) of the essential part of the quotation from the *True Tragedy*, unless I err in my interpretation of the two passages. The comparison (p. 511) of the latter part of *Richard III*, IV, iv, with the corresponding passage in the *True Tragedy*, likewise is fruitful. It is possible, moreover, that the appearance of ghosts to Richard, instead of the devils of the source, was due to the earlier play. So the gloomy aspect of the day of Bosworth fight, contrary to the bright skies of the chronicle account, may be due to the same source. Then there are the verbal resemblances, especially the famous line in the *True Tragedy*: "A horse, a horse, a fresh horse." Altogether the author considers some thirty items of possible proof, some of them sufficiently tenuous; but the main contention seems to be fairly substantiated, and Shakespeare's use of the *True Tragedy* seems highly probable.

FREDERIC IVES CARPENTER.

University of Chicago.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CHRIST 485-6.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the Biblical originals for *Christ* 475-490 there is no mention of idols, and I